

REMARKS

The Office Action has been received and reviewed. In the Office Action, claims 1-74 were rejected. In response to the Office Action, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Applicant has also amended claims 1, 21, 23, 26, 44, 46, 53 and 69. The claim amendments have been made to better describe the intended implementation of the invention, or to provide antecedent basis for some of the claim limitations, or to correct grammatical errors. No other reason should be attributed to the amendments.

If there are questions about this *Response*, please contact the undersigned. In view of the remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

Rejection Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In the Office Action, it was argued that claims 1-74 are anticipated and therefore not patentable pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,445,682 (Weitz). Weitz discloses a system for managing voice and data communications. Weitz seeks to enable voice, data, video and other communications to occur in an integrated manner.

In the Office Action, col. 18, line 37 through col. 19, line 20 of Weitz are cited in support of the argument that claims 1, 14, 17, 23, 35, 65 and 69 are disclosed by Weitz. This portion of Weitz references figures 3, 8A, 9A and 9B. To transfer a phone call using the Weitz system, a list of subscribers and

extensions are displayed, and an operator may select one of the subscribers by clicking on the subscriber's name or extension number. Once a subscriber is selected, the operator may transfer an incoming call to the selected subscriber by clicking on an icon entitled "transfer."

In the Office Action three arguments are made using Weitz as support. First, it was argued that the action signal icons of claims 1, 23, 44 and 69 can be equated with the animated icon and one or more icons which can cause a call to be answered. See Weitz at col. 18, lines 39-43. Second, it was argued in the Office Action that according to Weitz, a person could send a trigger signal by clicking on a call button. Third, in the Office Action it was argued that a controller receives that trigger signal, and the controller then identifies an associated action signal, causing the call to be answered.

It appears the argument in the Office Action is that when a call is received, the system operator may be presented with an animated icon and also one or more icons which can cause the call to be answered. It is assumed this is intended to equate to "providing a list of one or more action signal icons," as recited in claim 1. It also appears the argument in the Office Action is that the system operator can select one of the icons to answer the call. It is assumed this is intended to equate to "selecting at least one of the action signal icons to indicate a selected action signal," as required by claim 1. If taken as true, then in order to anticipate claim 1, Weitz would need to disclose action which equates to "associating the trigger signal with the

selected action signal." It is respectfully submitted that Weitz does not disclose such action.

In order to satisfy the limitations of claim 1, Weitz would need to disclose associating the selected action signal with the trigger signal. The transitive verb "associating" means

1: to join as a partner, friend, or
companion, 2: to keep company with: ATTEND 3:
to join or connect together: COMBINE 4: to
bring together or into relationship in any of
various intangible ways (as in memory or
imagination).

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th ed., 1998. It is respectfully submitted that in Weitz there is no associating of the trigger signal with the selected action signal. In Weitz, the two signals are not joined, connected together, combined, brought together or brought into relationship. Instead, the electronics of the Weitz system senses a call-received signal, and in response, the controller displays a list of icons. When one of the icons is selected, the controller causes the call to be answered.

It may be the case that Weitz discloses a situation in which a first signal (call-received signal) results in the sending of a second signal (answer-call signal). However, the fact that there is a cause and effect achieved via the controller does not mean the controller has engaged in associating two signals. Receiving the call-received signal does not necessarily mean that the

answer-call signal will be result. Therefore, the call-received signal and the answer-call signal in Weitz are not joined, connected, combined or brought together in a relationship. The Weitz signals are separate and distinct signals that cause a controller to perform specific activities.

In the present invention, the trigger signal and the action signal are associated such that when the trigger signal is received, the action signal is provided. In order to send the action signal, the system operator need not act when the corresponding trigger signal is received, because the trigger signal and the action signal previously have been associated with each other.

Since the dependent claims include all the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the arguments above with regard to the independent claims are equally applicable to the dependent claims. Consequently, dependent claims 2-22, 24-43, 45-68, and 70-74 are allowable.

For this reason, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1 through 74 be withdrawn, and that claims 1 through 74 be allowed.

Special Note Regarding Claim 38

In the Office Action, no arguments were provided which describe why claim 38 was rejected. Given the similarities between claims 17 and 38, this *Response* assumes there was an intent to reject claim 38 in the Office Action along with claim 17. If this assumption is not correct, please inform the

undersigned so that a response to the rejection of claim 38 may be made.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made. The claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant believes that no fee is due with this Response. If a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2442. Further, Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to file this Response. However, if an extension of time is needed, please consider this as a petition for a one-month extension of time.

The Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney if any questions remain following review of this response. If it will help, the undersigned is willing to explain by telephone or in person, the reasons the claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



R. Kent Roberts
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,786

Date: April 30, 2004

Hodgson Russ LLP
One M&T Plaza, Suite 2000
Buffalo, NY 14203-2391